THEOLOGY

VOL. LVI JANUARY, 1953 No. 391

Editorial

IF the English-speaking peoples are not at present reading the Bible so much as they ought, it is not because of any lack of versions suited to every intellectual level and to every variety of literary taste. Apart from abridgements and paraphrases[1] which would require separate consideration, the new English versions that have been produced in the twentieth century fall into three classes.

First, there are entirely fresh translations which draw upon all the resources that are offered by contemporary English usage in order to provide a rendering that is as accurate and as intelligible as possible. Of this class the best known are the translations by the late Dr James Moffatt and by Mgr Ronald Knox. It is understood that the new official version, upon which many British scholars are now at work, will also belong to this class.

Secondly, there are modern translations which, instead of drawing upon all the resources of the English language, are deliberately restricted to a limited vocabulary. Versions in simplified forms of English are specially intended for the use of readers overseas who have learned only a simplified form of the language. When a choice has to be made, they therefore prefer intelligibility to the greater accuracy that could be achieved with an unrestricted vocabulary. But since, as is well known, many British-born readers or potential readers of the Bible have at their command only a much more limited vocabulary than an English version which aimed primarily at accuracy would have to use, it is evident that versions of this class will be serviceable at home as well as abroad. *The Bible in Basic English* was published in 1949, and as we said at the time "it is a version which every reader of the English Bible may with advantage have at hand, though no one in his senses will be satisfied to depend on it alone".[2] Another version of the New Testament, belonging to this class, has recently been published: this is *The New Testament: a new translation in Plain English* by C. Kingsley Williams (S.P.C.K. and Longmans, 8s. 6d.[3]). "Plain English" has a larger vocabulary than "Basic"—about 2,000 words: it was worked out as a means of teaching English in India and Africa. For the New Testament some additional words have been used, but the meaning of them all is explained in a glossary at the end of the volume. As a readable version

[1] Admittedly, it is not easy to draw a hard-and-fast distinction between translation and paraphrase. See an article on "Translation or Paraphrase" in *The Bible Translator* (periodical for the assistance of Bible translators), United Bible Societies, London, July 1950, pp. 97–106.

[2] See *Theology*, September 1949, p. 359.

[3] It is also published in two parts: I. The Gospels and Acts; II. The Epistles and Apocalypse. 6s. each.

1.56
1953

it seems to us more successful than that in Basic English. While we should be sorry if it should ever be deemed necessary to use it as the regular thing in liturgical worship, there can be no doubt that the message of the New Testament will very often get across most easily through this medium—in Bible classes and mission services as well as in private reading. Sometimes, indeed, simplified English achieves a more illuminating rendering than an ampler vocabulary would hit upon, as in this instance:

> Our common life is even now in heaven; and we are waiting for a saviour from heaven, the Lord Jesus Christ, who will change our poor earthly body, and make it like his glorious body through the power by which he is able to put everything under himself. (Phil. 3. 20 f.)

The third class of new version is characterized by the fact that it is a revision of the Authorized (or King James) Version of 1611, and not an entirely fresh translation. Such was the English Revised Version of 1881 and the corresponding American Standard Version of 1901. Such also is *The Holy Bible: Revised Standard Version* of 1952 (Nelson, 30s.), of which about two million copies have already been sold in the U.S.A. The R.S.V. of the New Testament has been available since 1946 and has been steadily making its way. The R.S.V. is a great improvement on the R.V., because it is based on what is assuredly a more accurate text of the original sources, and because its emendations of the A.V. are as a rule more idiomatic, more intelligible and more euphonious. Let us give three examples from familiar passages.

> The wings of the ostrich wave proudly;
> but are they the pinions and plumage of love?
> For she leaves her eggs to the earth,
> and lets them be warmed on the ground,
> forgetting that a foot may crush them,
> and that the wild beast may trample them.
> She deals cruelly with her young, as if they were not hers;
> though her labor be in vain, yet she has no fear;
> because God has made her forget wisdom,
> and given her no share in understanding.
> When she rouses herself to flee,
> she laughs at the horse and his rider. (Job 39. 13–18.)

> But I have calmed and quieted my soul,
> like a child quieted at its mother's breast;
> like a child that is quieted is my soul. (Psalm 131. 2.)

> He told them a parable also: "No one tears a piece from a new garment and puts it upon an old garment; if he does, he will tear the new, and the piece from the new will not match the old."
>
> (Luke 5. 36.)

There is much to be said for continuing normally to read the A.V. in public worship. There is now very little to be said for reading the R.V., and everything to be said for allowing the R.S.V. to be read in its place, at least for an experimental period. Principal Elmslie has said that if the R.S.V. "is read in churches, the worshippers will be much more likely to find themselves listening".[1] That might, of

[1] *The Spectator*, 14 November 1952.

course, be said of the reading of any unfamiliar version, and would not necessarily be a commendation. Of the versions that are now available, the R.S.V. is the one that most deserves to be commended on this as well as on other grounds.

* * * * *

We publish this month the first of a series of about twelve articles on "Great Pastors". Opinions may differ about whether preaching can again become what it has been in former ages or whether it is needful that it should do so, in view of other means of communication that now exist. There can, however, be no question that the pastoral work of the Church, if it is to fulfil its purpose, must always be personal and direct. It is therefore likely that consideration of the methods followed by Christian pastors in the course of history will yield instruction and suggestion that are of permanent and of present value.

Time

WHAT is Time? Sophocles speaks of it as a "gentle deity",[1] but the usual Greek conception is more savage; for Chronos devours his sons as soon as they are born. This depicts Time's terrifying transience. "Time like an ever rolling stream bears all its sons away", is a familiar modern way of putting it. Prospero speaks of "the dark backward and abysm of time",[2] and Heraclitus began his philosophy from the statement that "everything flows" (*πάντα ῥεῖ*); a phrase which Tennyson echoes when he speaks of the "forward-flowing stream of time".[3] Even friends, as Job reminds us, can pass, unreliable as snow. "What time they wax warm they vanish, and when it is hot they are consumed out of their place".[4]

But whatever Time's instability, we cannot get away from it. Kant's well-known tenet is that Space and Time are both categories of the human mind only, and that we cannot function without them. Everything, for us mortals, happens sometime and somewhere. We are imprisoned by Time; and the question therefore becomes, not so much what we can do about it by way of speculation, as what we are to do with it by way of practice. A quality so transient may indeed, as Prospero says, seem "abysmal"; and yet a Christian Apostle echoing a Jewish prophet can say, "Now is the acceptable time",[5] his word "acceptable" (*δεκτός*) meaning not only *acceptus* but *gratus* (welcome). How can what is often a dark and backward abysm, as we look back upon it in the past, be a welcome and acceptable factor as we view it now, in the present? To such questions Christianity has its own special answers. Here are some of them.

(1) *Time is a Grace.* Recall first our English phrase "this year of grace". We apply the phrase to any year of the Christian era, imply-

[1] *χρόνος γάρ εὐμαρὴς θέος*, *Electra*, 179. [2] *The Tempest*, Act I, Sc. 2.
[3] *Recollections*. [4] Job 6. 17. [5] 1 Cor. 6. 2; Is. 49. 8.

336362

ing that Time has in it the seeds of mercy. This is indeed an acceptable and welcome thought to those who are conscious that often in the past, like seed on rocky ground, "in time of temptation they fell away". What a blessing then to have what Francis Bacon calls "the inescapable property of Time, ever to unfold new truths, give us new chances, new hopes".[1] The late Sir Percy Buck was wont to say to his music students at the Royal College of Music, "When you find you are in the wrong, throw your cap in the air." He meant what Swift meant when he said, "A man should never be ashamed to own he has been in the wrong, which is but saying in other words, that he is wiser to-day than he was yesterday."[2] Time mercifully allows us this grace.

Søren Kierkegaard, the Danish philosopher, in a New Year's Discourse, asks what New Year's gift a good man might wish to bestow on another. Material gifts and prosperity? Perhaps. But he might wish even more fervently to bestow upon him some spiritual gift, such as faith to believe in God and follow him. Would not this be the supremest of all gifts? Yes, it would. And yet no one who is but mortal can offer such a gift to another, for we all have this gift already, whether we know it or not. Faith is not the prerogative of the few, it is a gift to all; a gift which it is ours to potentiate and use. It is a gift in Time, whereby the grace of Time may be rightly used. "Another year has passed," says Kierkegaard in a beautiful prayer. "We thank thee, O heavenly Father, that it was a time of grace, and we are not terrified that it was also a time for which we shall render account, for we trust in thy mercy."[3] To believe in God is to believe in the "acceptable time". The psalmist believed it when he said, "For this shall every one that is godly make his prayer unto thee in a time when they mayest be found." And another psalmist says, "Lord, I make my prayer unto thee in an acceptable time. Hear me, O God, in the multitude of thy mercy. Take me out of the mire, that I sink not. Let not the water flood drown me, neither let the deep swallow me up. Hear me, O Lord, for thy loving-kindness is comfortable; turn thee unto me in the multitude of thy mercies." Time, in which opportunities for such mercy are available, is indeed a gift of grace. When we die, Time as a day of grace is over.

(2) *Time is an Instrument.* Prayers and aspirations, such as those just quoted, are of no use unless Time be accepted as an instrument. We either use it or lose it. Grace, of which we have spoken, is not cheap. It cannot be had by mere passivity. There is only one epitaph for the tomb of Time's wasted opportunities: "Lost and gone for ever." "Dost thou love life?" asks Benjamin Franklin, "then do not squander time, for it is the stuff life is made of."[4] Kierkegaard rightly says that because of God's mercy "we are not terrified" about the future. But the very mercy is given on condition that we be not slack about the future. "Pass the time of your sojourning here in fear",

[1] *Advancement of Learning*, 2.
[2] *Thoughts on Various Subjects*, sometimes attributed to Pope.
[3] *Edifying Discourses*, I, 6 (Vaerker III, 19).
[4] *Pennsylvania Almanac*, 1758.

says St Peter;[1] and there is reality and urgency in the injunction. Similarly, St Paul bids us "work out our salvation with fear and trembling".[2] Such phrases do not contradict Kierkegaard, as though we were after all to be "terrified". They mean that opportunities are a matter of urgent concern. When does this come home to us more than at the New Year? Then, if ever, we may take Hosea's words to heart and conscience, "Sow to yourselves in righteousness, break up your fallow ground, for it is time to seek the Lord till he come and reign in righteousness upon you."[3] The very promises of Grace demand no less of us. They demand that we take stock, sow anew, work out our salvation—in a word, cleanse our hearts and bodies. "Having these promises, we must cleanse ourselves from all defilement of flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God."[4]

But a warning is here necessary. Rose Macaulay once wrote that New Year's resolutions are foolish, because, having broken them on January 2nd, you have to wait till next January 1st to renew them. She is ironically voicing a deep truth. Duty does not brook delay. "God never imposes a duty without a time to do it", says Ruskin.[5] That time will have no procrastination or postponement. Any time means no time. "*Now* it is high time to awake out of sleep," says St Paul, "*now* is the acceptable time"[6]—that is, the time to be welcomed. Life is too short to lose opportunities. "O remember how short my time is", sighs the psalmist; "so teach us to number our days that we may apply our hearts to wisdom."[7]

(3) *Time is a Sacrament.* If we ask why this urgency exists, the question emerges, Is it for temporal advantage, or something more? It could only be the former if we were the creatures of Time alone, like (let us say) the plants. But men are creatures of something more than Time, as Plato taught us long ago. We are creatures of Eternity also. We have spoken of the importance of Time; but Time is not the whole of reality. It is the sacrament of Eternity. Hence Daniel's "time of the end" is ever with us; not in the sense that Eternity comes only at the end of Time, though that no doubt is true, but in the sense that Eternity is a quality perceived in and through Time, always with us even on the plane of Time. It is the "end" of Time in the sense of being Time's fulfilment. Rather than speak of Eternity as being the mere temporal "end" of Time, we may speak of this life as a "time of the end". Eternity is revealed in Time; just as when we stand, for example, in Westminster Abbey, the "silent touches of time", as Burke calls them,[8] speak to us of the eternal. Time is a vehicle, not an illusion, as the doctrines of Karma and Maya would teach. And if so we may value time, not belittle it.

But is Eternity, which is perfection, impersonal? Or is it the throne, so to say, of perfect Personality? The man who believes in God has no doubt about the answer. For him Personality is the ultimate reality. The Christian goes further. He sees perfect personality centred in Christ, very God and very Man, and therefore Christ

[1] 1 Pet. 1. 17. [2] Phil. 11. 12. [3] Hos. 10. 12. [4] 2 Cor. 7. 1.
[5] *Seven Lamps of Architecture*, Lecture 2. [6] Rom. 13. 11.
[7] Ps. 90. 12. [8] *Letter to Matthew Smith.*

is the perfect embodiment of the Time/Eternity relationship. St John, who says that "no man hath seen God at any time", is foremost to emphasize that "he that hath seen the Christ hath seen the Father".[1] How? Not with earthly eyes, but with the eye of faith. How right Kierkegaard is to speak of faith as the best of all gifts. Christian faith fixes its eye on Christ, and in a new and penetrating way discovers that Time is the sacrament of Eternity. The Christian is concerned therefore, with all his powers, to use this instrument, Time, as a means whereby to lay hold on Eternity. If and when he fails, he knows still that he lives in a time of grace wherein God is merciful. Time ceases to be for him the dark and abysmal thing that Prospero asserts it to be. It becomes to him a grace given by God, and instrument to be used by man, and a sacrament whereby man may appropriate the Eternal.

T. H. Croxall.

Charles Gore

An important and interesting letter about Dr Gore addressed to Dr Albert Mansbridge is now, as far as the present writer is able to discover, published for the first time. The writer, George Herbert Tremenheere, Vicar of St Agatha's, Landport, of St Frideswide's, Oxford, Warden of the House of Mercy, Clewer, and Chaplain to the Clergy House of Rest, West Malvern, was a life-long friend of Dr Gore, and therefore his words will be read with especial interest. Gore died on 17 January 1932. He was born on 22 January 1853. This letter to Dr Mansbridge and the notes that follow may appropriately make their appearance at the time of the Gore centenary.

Clergy House of Rest,
West Malvern.
4th April 1932.

Dear Dr Mansbridge,

I promised that I would try to write you something about Dr Gore after Easter. Last week, however, I was obliged to give priority to something else.

I am afraid you have a difficult task before you: his life was so many sided, and so amazingly fruitful in achievement; and then all those who knew him best have passed away except Bishop Talbot, and in a less degree Wilfrid Richmond; though you have Wilfred Cooper who can tell you all about his life and work as Bishop of Oxford, for he saw it from inside.

You, I expect, had most to do with C.G. in connexion with his interest in what are called social problems, and the work of the W.E.A. But, great and real as his interest was in those it was never, I believe, his predominant interest. That, I should say, was theology; not theology, however, as an abstract intellectual study, but as the guardian and interpreter of the Christian Revelation, the Christian Gospel which he held to be the one cure for the ills of the world.

---

[1] John 14. 9; cf. 1. 18.

Then next, but really as part of his theology, came the maintenance of the Christian moral standard, and its application to every department of life, individual, relation of classes, industrial problems, national and international conduct. So I believe that his "social" zeal was due to this moral motive and not to the humanitarian motive of making life easier or pleasanter. Then too, pervading his life, there was the pastoral yearning for souls. It was this which led him to leave Oxford in 1879 and go to work in Bootle and then in Liverpool, St Margaret's, Prince's Park. It was this which made him so accessible to individuals who needed his help.

Gore was one of a trio of devout and keen Catholic-minded schoolboys at Harrow. The other two were Edward Vincent Eyre, to whom he sent me as curate at Holy Redeemer, Clerkenwell, and George W. E. Russell. But I did not get to know him till after he had been a Scholar of Balliol and had become a young Fellow of Trinity. When I went up in January 1879 he asked me to his rooms and took me for walks, and although he left in my second term, I have owed much to him ever since. It was a wonderful experience to have him as Vice-Principal during my year at Cuddesdon: his lectures on the Gospels, the Epistle to the Romans, on Early Church History, and on Dogmatics, gave what was to us a new meaning and intelligibility to the Faith and to the Scriptures. While at Cuddesdon he gave a course of quite original lectures in the Schools at Oxford on weekday evenings on the relation of Natural Science to the Faith. These were attended by a large number of undergraduates and graduates. I have the syllabus of them but they were never published.

When he was appointed first Principal of the Pusey House, he chose as his colleagues men very different from himself, though in complete harmony in religion; V. S. S. Coles, a man of widespread spiritual influence and great geniality, and F. E. Brightman, a man of learning. It was my privilege to be with them for three months in 1889. Many of the ablest undergraduates used to come for talks with Gore, while Coles laid himself out more for the average man. Besides lectures in the House, Gore gave a course in Trinity on the Incarnation, which was so largely attended that it had to be moved from a Lecture-Room to the Hall. These were the basis of his celebrated Bampton Lectures of 1891. But in 1889 had come out *Lux Mundi*, written by twelve of the ablest men on the Christian side in Oxford (though Arthur Lyttleton had by that time migrated to Selwyn, Cambridge). These gave, on the whole, an entirely orthodox presentation of the Catholic Faith, but in an original manner, using such methods as would best commend it to the prevalent thought of the best intellects of the day. It was the concluding portion of Gore's essay on the Holy Spirit and Inspiration which attracted most attention and opposition. But of this I shall have more to say later. He tried to clear up misunderstandings by a new preface in 1890, and added two University Sermons on Sin, in 1905, to supply what had been felt as an omission; and in 1895 he had published three Dissertations, of which that on the Virgin Birth of our Lord, and that on his consciousness, had direct reference to his Essay and his Bamptons.

It was while he was at the Pusey House also that Gore founded the Society of the Resurrection. It was intended to help clergy to lead stricter lives under a Rule of life and devotion based on the monastic vows, but adapted to those living in the world. This was in 1887. Affiliated with it was the Oxford Mission Brotherhood of the Epiphany in Calcutta. It was hoped from the first that the Society should develop into a Religious Community, and this came about when the Community of the Resurrection was begun in the Pusey House, moved with Gore to the vicarage of Radley, and when he became canon, to Little Cloisters, Westminster, eventually finding a permanent home at Mirfield. The remainder of the Society lasted till 1924, when it was combined with one similar. The Community did not bind its members by vows for life; so Dr Gore thought it best to withdraw from membership when he was made bishop, though he continued to be closely associated with it.

Others can tell you better than I can of his episcopate at Worcester (where he chose to live in a hired house in the city instead of in Hartlebury Castle), of his founding of the see of Birmingham, and of his work there. It has been said that he made a mistake in consenting to be translated to the see of Oxford; but I do not think so. The diocese of three counties was much more difficult to work than compact Birmingham; he did not understand the countryman so well as the townsman; and it is said that his political opinions set the Buckinghamshire squires against his project of a see of Buckingham; but it was partly their natural disinclination to be disjoined from a see with the prestige of Oxford, and they did make a suffragan see possible. But really no one but he could have been fittingly appointed to Oxford. It was good to have his intellectual influence within reach; the mission to undergraduates in St. Mary's was a great spiritual success, many seeking interviews with him, and some making their first confessions; and the country clergy, if they sometimes found his letters formidable, were won by his presence. He had a high ideal of pastoral work, and if he found an incumbent was not trying to rise to it, he could be severe; but was by no means wanting in sympathy for their difficulties. During the National Mission of 1915 he urged all the clergy of the diocese to come into retreat for three days, and arranged retreats at four centres, one of which he took himself. Nor was he forgetful of hospitality; besides entertaining individual clergy, he took great pains, and incurred considerable expense, over a garden party [was it not held in the Hall of Christ Church?] for all the clergy of the diocese and their wives; and the warm welcome which he gave them was much appreciated.

Dr Gore's ecclesiastical policy as a bishop was to seek unity in the Church of England by recalling each party to a loyal adherence to her formularies and discipline. He did not take the modern Anglican view that these stood by themselves in self-sufficiency; they were part of the Faith and discipline of the Catholic Church of which the Church of England was part: at the same time he was willing to give as wide an interpretation to these formularies as could fairly and honestly be claimed. He put forth this position especially in his letter

to the clergy of the diocese, entitled "The Basis of Anglican Fellowship" (1914). Unhappily there was small response to his appeal.

There is a popular impression, arising in the first instance from part of his essay in *Lux Mundi*, that Dr Gore was somewhat unorthodox in his teaching, indeed, "something of a Modernist". That is quite a mistake. Personally I could not accept some of his positions; but his principles were as different as possible from those of "Modernists". Modernism in the original sense of the word, may be said to have inspired *Lux Mundi*—i.e. the desire to express the old and unchanged truths in modern forms of thought and words; but "Modernism" soon came to be something very different from that. Gore had no use for a faith evacuated of its meaning which represented only the ever-changing opinions resulting from human speculations: he believed with all his heart in the Church as a Society founded by him, and endowed with the perpetual presence of his Spirit, enlightening and guiding it. Therefore he held that "quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est" was something to be accepted with complete confidence. On the other hand, this covered only the central truths of religion, and left much which was open to variety of opinion and theological discussion. It was said that he had read all the Fathers, both Greek and Latin, before he was ordained, and he always laid great store by them. But his mind was beautifully honest, and he was determined not to shut his eyes to, or explain away, any fact or evidence which might seem contrary: it was always to be faced and allowed for. In his essay in *Lux Mundi*, he began with the familiar and ancient Catholic belief, that the Holy Scriptures rested on the authority of the Church, and were to be understood in her sense; he went on to what was practically the same position as Newman's, and that of the Councils of Trent and the Vatican, that their inspiration guaranteed their teaching on faith and morals, and not their general statements. It was only when this led to questions about our Lord's human knowledge that he trod on doubtful ground. He considered, however, that he had the support of some of the Fathers; and he never allowed that our Lord was otherwise than infallible in the whole of his actual teaching. But whatever we may think of his treatment of this question, he was undoubtedly in intention on the orthodox side. It was a shock and grief to him when Dr Sanday, in his old age, made it known that he had given up some of the convictions for which he had for years contended; and his own failure to induce the bishops to take a firmer stand against those clergy who were denying articles of the Creed and primary Christian beliefs was, more than anything else, the cause of his resigning his see. He could not share the responsibility for such a betrayal. Thenceforth he could defend the faith best by his pen. Hence the wonderful trilogy which was the work of his later years.

If there was one thing which he felt more than the attack on Christian faith, it was the subsequent attack on Christian morals, most of all when a majority of Anglican bishops assembled at Lambeth surrendered to that attack. Hence with all the energies of his last years he took up the cause of the League of National Life.

In spite of all his other work, Dr Gore did not neglect the call of Missions. Not only did he, since Dr Holland's death, preside at the evening meetings of the Universities' Mission to Central Africa, but three times he went out to help the Oxford Mission to Calcutta. Indeed, on the third occasion it was to help the Church in India at large; for in 1930 to 1931 he travelled over a great part of India for sermons, speeches and interviews, and so overtaxed his strength that this was the primary cause of his death.

I hope these remarks are not too fragmentary to be of use to you. I should be glad to have them returned to me eventually.

Believe me,

Yours sincerely,

G. H. Tremenheere.

P.S.—Every really important book, whether English or foreign, was to be seen on his table shortly after its publication; and in a few days he had mastered its contents. He read rapidly and had the knack of getting quickly at the heart of a book, and yet grasping and remembering accurately its chief points. He always read from ten o'clock until midnight. If he had guests he would spend the time with them between dinner and Compline, but would then shut himself up in his study. Yet he was always in his private chapel at 7.30 for the Holy Communion on the following morning.

This letter was evidently a rough draft. The post scriptum is written in pencil. It is not likely that the letter was ever sent. Indeed, Dr Mansbridge says that he never had it "so far as I can remember or find trace".[1]

It may be interesting at this point to trace the course of the friendship of the two men as it is seen in Dr Gore's letters. In 1883 Gore was appointed first Principal of the Pusey House, an institution which was designed to carry on the most valuable part of Dr Pusey's work. It was to be, in the words of Dr Liddon, a "home of sacred learning and a rallying point for Christian faith, and thus it will strengthen all that is dearest to a sincere Christian at what, so far as we can judge, must always be one of the chief centres of the mental life of this country". The first Librarians, as the Principal's assistants are still called, were V. S. S. Coles and F. E. Brightman. Gore had not been long at Pusey House before he invited Tremenheere, whom he had known at Trinity College and Cuddesdon, to join his staff. "I can't help wondering", he wrote on 14 October 1887, "whether it would not be a good thing for you after a time to come to the P.H. for at least a good bout of study, a genial spiritual discipline, with some preaching etc."

Less than a week after Gore wrote to his friend as follows:

> I think it is likely Community life wd help you & that it wd be of great profit to the Church that you shd give yourself to prayer & study & such

[1] The substance of it, however, appears to have been printed in *The Great Malvern Parish Magazine*, October 1934, two years and a half after the date of this letter.

work as naturally grows out of it (preaching etc etc) We greatly and increasingly need non-parochial Priests. . . . If you come here we shd offer Board & Lodging etc (all told) & whatever more was necessary up to £100, all to arrangement. We haven't come to common purse yet. [One has £60, one £50, one nothing.]

This letter is interesting as showing the ideals of the first Principal of Pusey House for this new venture. Mr Gordon Crosse tells us the "greatest outcome of the Pusey House period was the Community of the Resurrection". In a "Roll of the Brotherhood, 1877" there are twenty-one names, headed by "Superior—Charles Gore, Pusey House Oxford". Amongst these names are those of Frank Brightman, Vincent Coles, Henry Denison, Arthur Lethbridge, Berkeley Randolph, Darwell Stone, and George Tremenheere. It was not, however, until 25 July 1892 that Gore and five others made their profession as the first members of the Community of the Resurrection. To quote Mr Crosse again: "He would have no formal rigidity. The rule was simple, the brethren wore no distinguishing dress but the cassock, nor did they assume the title of Father. Gore was Superior from the first, but preferred to be addressed as 'Senior'."

Meanwhile Gore was becoming more and more interested in his foundation of the Community of the Resurrection. He wrote from Pusey House a letter dated "All Saints Eve" of which the year is not given, but which Tremenheere marks with a query "1887", telling of its closer fellowship with the Brotherhood of the Epiphany in Calcutta, and his anxiety for recruits for this important missionary venture.

This is, we hope, a step—not more—in the direction of an Oratorian sort of community.

It is constituted by the amalgamation of our body with the Calcutta Missioners.

Perhaps you will write, if you or any of yr friends are likely to be feeling in such a direction.

Gore was now beginning to feel that it was impossible to let Pusey House remain any longer the home of the community lest the latter should divert the former from its original purpose. He therefore in 1893 resigned the office of Principal, and became Vicar of Radley. The work of a country priest was not exactly a task for which Gore was adapted, though he carried out its duties with unfailing diligence. "Pray for a country parson", he wrote to his friend on 13 October, "who feels 'good intentions' but is terribly at sea." It was with a sense of profound relief that Gore accepted a canonry at Westminster. Here he soon became immersed in a round of activities—preaching, lecturing, writing, advising, planning on social reform and other problems. Most of his letters at this period, his biographer tells, were dictated, even to his intimate friends. One such dictated letter was written to Tremenheere, who was anxious for a visit and troubled about the use of incense in his new parish. The concluding message is in Gore's own handwriting:

As to the decision, I entirely agree with you. As a matter of personal judgment I profoundly disagree with it, but I do not think disobedience

to the existing authorities can be a duty, except where they are plainly going against some prescription of the Church.

Where it is not a duty to disobey it is plainly a duty to obey. I think this is a doubtful matter in itself in which it is plainly our duty to obey.

I am very sorry for you.

I sd try to make terms for the use of incense before the service.

A few days afterwards came the following in Gore's own handwriting:

I am for incense as much as we can, but not at the cost of direct disobedience. I shd, I think, if I was vicar of an incense-burning Church, intimate to my bishop that I would cease to use it *in the service*. If he is satisfied with that I shd be disposed to cense the Church before service, which I gather is not discordant with the idea of incense as Walter Frere states it i.e. the *making an atmosphere for worship* (actually & symbolically).

To retain it in some form makes it easier to recover it.

Towards the end of 1901 Gore was nominated to the diocese of Worcester and consecrated on 23 February of the following year. In March 1905 the diocese of Birmingham having been founded partly from the diocese of Worcester and partly from that of Lichfield, Gore became its first bishop.

Gore became Bishop of Oxford in 1911 and here Tremenheere followed him as diocesan chaplain. As the two friends saw a good deal of one another during this period not many letters passed between them. A brief undated card from the bishop is worthy of quotation as showing how much he looked to his old friend for help and support.

I want you to give the addresses for the ordinands before Trinity S. (Thursday evening May 15 & Friday 16th) & to preach in the Church here at the Ordn. on Sunday, briefly as to breakfastless hearers.

In 1911 Tremenheere was for six months in charge of the parish of St Giles, Oxford, at the bishop's request. In 1914 Dr Gore appointed him to the important industrial parish of St Frideswide, a growing housing parish on the Botley road, succeeding once more, as was pointed out, "to an inheritance of parochial difficulties which he encountered with firm loyalty and sound theology". Here Mr Tremenheere stayed until 1922, and here in 1921 he married Kate Mary Sankey, elder daughter of Dr Heurtley Sankey, Medical Superintendent for many years at Littlemore Asylum. In 1922 Tremenheere was approached as to his willingness to become Warden of the House of Mercy Clewer. He was anxious to make no move in the matter without the approval of his old friend, who had resigned the diocese of Oxford and taken a house in London not far from Grosvenor Chapel. Gore well knew the difficulties at Clewer and wrote to advise Tremenheere to take a firm line if he accepted the appointment.

I dare say you have talked to East about the difficulty he finds in his work. Someone is wanted who sympathises with & understands the religious life & who is prepared to enter into the difficulties & points of view of Religious & bear with their infirmities & who will also see the

increasing perils to which religious orders are exposed & will be ready to warn them e.g. of the necessity of giving the younger Sisters sufficient share in management & 'voice' enough in the affairs of the Community. Both East & Philpotts, I gather, & the Chaplain are by no means satisfied with Clewer.

I think you would have all the requisite appreciation of the Religious point of view, & are not too old to learn their ways, & you would also be firm, & not allow them (as they like to do) to *run* the priesthood as an appanage of the Sisterhood without a will of its own! On the whole I am decidedly in favour of your saying *yes*. But you must make East tell you the whole truth & you might see Philpotts (who is however by nature a grumbler wherever he is) & the Chaplain. But I dare say he is rather revolutionary.

With every good Easter wish to you & Mrs Trem.

In 1927 Tremenheere became chaplain to the Clergy House of Rest, West Malvern, and here he remained until his death on 28 July 1936.

During the winter of 1930 to 1931 Dr Gore visited India a third time. He tired himself out by incessant travelling and preaching. He was much concerned about the current proposals for Church union in South India. On his return to England Gore wrote on a postcard to his old friend what was evidently his last message:

Thank you. I won't write a letter. Apparently I acquired 'a tired heart' in India & I have never got well of it & its accompaniments. I have to give up all preaching & public speaking till next Easter is over. Meanwhile I have only to keep quiet & I can read & write in reason. The Dr assures me that I ought to be as well abt next Easter as I was before I went to India. But we shall see. I am not allowed to go to meetings at present. Everybody is very good—too good—to me.

Charles Gore died on 17 January 1932. A Requiem Mass was sung by Bishop Frere at Holy Trinity, Sloane Street. George Herbert Tremenheere hastened to pay his last tribute. But the oldest living friend of the dead bishop was unable to gain admission to the clergy vestry, filled as it was with younger men. Such is the penalty sometimes paid for getting old. It was, however, a penalty doubtless gladly paid for the privilege of the friendship of a great bishop, prophet and theologian.

R. D. Middleton.

The Life After Death[1]

Rev. 14. 13. Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth: Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours; and their works do follow them.

There are few themes of more widespread and perennial interest than that of the Life after Death; for it is one with which the literatures and philosophies no less than the religions of the world are deeply concerned. Their testimonies are of almost infinite diversity; and even within Christianity alone many different ideas have held sway on the subject at different times. This diversity indicates that we are here confronted with a great mystery and must be content on many points to be agnostic. But that does not absolve us from seeking

[1] The substance of a sermon delivered before the University of Oxford.

such light as Scripture and the Church's teaching and human reason seem to afford.

I speak of Life after Death rather than of Survival or of Immortality. Survival is the word best used to denote the findings and teachings of one important school of Psychical Research and of their followers on a quite different level, namely the plane of Spiritualism. Of the former, I will only say that I think they make out their case; the evidence as investigated and weighed by responsible scientifically minded men does seem to me to point to survival after death as highly probable. Of Spiritualism it is more difficult to form a judgment; I have known a case where one visit to a *séance* did great good, and of another where the information alleged to be given was completely at sea; and of yet others where the habit of spiritualistic inquiry has been definitely harmful. I do not think that the warning contained in the story of the witch of Endor is by any means obsolete. But even if we accord to this line of inquiry, even at its highest, real evidential value, what have we gained? It has been said that there is no evidence of communication from this side with anyone who has been dead for more than 300 years. But let it be as long as 3,000 years, what advantage have we? There is still no proof that the person who has survived so long does not die after that. There is no evidence of Immortality. Some comfort, no doubt, is brought to those who have no other faith or source of strength in sorrow. But how much comfort? If all that we can be assured of is some prolongation of this present life, many of us would hesitate to desire it. What we want after death is not merely to be relieved of the ills of the body, but to be different, better people.

Immortality: I suppose the belief that the soul is immortal is taught in some form or other by every religion in the world, however crude it be: Westermarck, at any rate, says that the apparent exceptions are dubious and inconsistent. The universality of a belief is not a proof of its truth; but where such a belief, and the affections and hopes and other promptings of the human heart which accompany it, are upheld on other grounds by many of the greatest philosophical schools of Europe and of Asia over the greater part of recorded human history, then it comes to us with a weight of authority not lightly to be gainsaid. The question is rather of the form which the belief takes. The most widely diffused form is that known as Metempsychosis or the Transmigration of Souls—the doctrine that the soul after death is reincarnated on earth in another living creature, human or animal, according to its deserts, and that this process is repeated until it is wholly purified. Thereafter the soul is either received into the company of other just souls made perfect living in what we should call heaven (this was the Orphic doctrine) or else reabsorbed (as Plato and Aristotle maintained) into the divine spirit from which it came. Moreover this belief has a strong ethical savour; as Plato writes in the closing paragraph of the *Republic*, "If you will believe with me that the soul is immortal and able to endure all good and ill, we shall keep always to the upward way and in all things pursue justice with the help of wisdom."

The doctrine of the inherent immortality of the soul left a deep mark on Christian thought. The emphasis which Christianity laid on human personality and its indefeasible claims made the idea of Reincarnation indigestible by the Christian tradition, despite the contrary view of the great African divine, Origen; but not so immortality; and from the time of St Augustine to the end of the scholastic age it was the dominant belief. Finally, in 1513, Pope Leo X issued a Bull which contained the words, "We condemn and reprobate all those who assert that the intellectual soul is mortal." Was he right or wrong? I believe that he was wrong.

In a book entitled *Studies Subsidiary to Bishop Butler* Mr Gladstone observed that the tenet of the natural immortality of the soul "never was affirmed by the Councils, never by the undivided Church, never by East or West when separated", until Leo X anathematized its denial. It was a case, he said, and an unparalleled case, of a philosophical doctrine "creeping in" disguised as a truth of divine revelation. Moreover it is noteworthy that it is not to be found in the New Testament. Not only is the word very rare there, but St Paul seems almost to exclude the belief when he speaks, in phrases familiar to us all, of this corruptible putting on incorruption and this mortal immortality. It is instructive also to note that when St Athanasius in his *de Incarnatione* argues for the natural *mortality* of man apart from Christ, he repeatedly quotes Scripture; yet when in his *Contra Gentes* he argues for the natural *immortality* of the soul, he never quotes Scripture once. And Athanasius was not one to omit the appeal to Scripture, if in fact it could be made.

There is yet a further consideration to make us hesitate to accept this doctrine. It has been in history the sheet-anchor of the doctrine of hell, and must indeed be credited with some of its most fearful consequences. Not that there is not a real problem to be faced here; and I am no Universalist; the destiny of the finally unrepentant, if such there be, is not, I believe, to be so easily evaded. But still less is it to be expounded along the lines of Eternal Punishment. When, for example, Tertullian wrote, "How shall I admire, how laugh, how rejoice, how exult, when I behold so many proud monarchs groaning in the lowest abyss of darkness; so many magistrates, who persecuted the name of the Lord, liquefying in fiercer flames than they ever kindled against the Christians," and so on; when he thought and wrote like that, and when Christian artists of later ages took him at his word, they had behind them not only a spirit of revenge—a spirit so conspicuously absent from Plato's treatment of eternal punishment—but also a certain logic; and it was the logic of the immortality of the soul.

And here let me pause for a moment to observe that our objection lies not to the symbolism in these cases, but to what is symbolized. For we are moving here in a region where symbolism is inevitable. We are bound in religion to use symbols, images, picture-language; we do it every time we begin to say the Lord's Prayer or the Creed; and in this matter of the life after death we have to use them in full measure. But let us be sure that what we are trying in this language

to express commands the assent of our reason and our moral judgment. Let us remember also that in the language of religion statements of time no less than of place are often largely symbolic.

The teaching of the New Testament about the life after death revolves around two themes which recur again and again in its pages and in every section of them. The first is Eternal Life; the second is the Resurrection of the Dead. *Eternal Life.* Both words in this phrase are significant. The Greek word for "life" is not *βίος*, the usual word for man's life on earth, which can be long or short, happy or miserable, but *ζωή*; and *ζωή* represents a word which in the Aramaic that our Lord spoke is a feminine plural. It is something, that is to say, which is not quantitatively but qualitatively different from life on earth. Its meaning is enhanced, moreover, by the adjective *αἰώνιος*, translated "eternal" or "everlasting" and denoting something which transcends all human measurement and is without beginning or end. Moreover this "eternal life", which is properly attributed only to God himself, consists, in man's case, in a relationship. "This is life eternal," our Lord said, "that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent." It is not part of man's natural endowment, that is to say, but is imparted to him by God himself, who also, through the Holy Ghost, prompts the faith which receives it. Just as the Holy Spirit is the earnest, or first instalment, of the Kingdom of God, so is the gift of eternal life, which we receive here and now, a foretaste of the heavenly life which we may receive hereafter.

With this doctrine the New Testament combines that of the Resurrection of the Dead. It is a doctrine not of the immortality of the soul but of resurrection, or, as it is sometimes also phrased, the resurrection of the body. St Paul makes it plain that this does not mean the re-animation of the body of "flesh and blood" which is buried in the earth or the sea, but the gift of a spiritual incorruptible and glorious body appropriate to the life beyond. It means that the personality is transformed and renewed after death not as a disembodied soul, not as a ghost, but with all that is needed for its self-expression and its power to communicate with others. What is promised to the Christian is fullness of personal life in fellowship with God.

The giver of this eternal life—in part received here, in fullness hereafter—is God; and he gives it through Christ, who laid down his own life for our sins and took it again for our justification when he rose from the dead. Does this mean that only Christians can be saved, and that there is no life after death for those who have never heard the Gospel and do not know Christ's name? There is a persistent strain of thought in Christian theology, deriving from what St John says about "the true light which lighteth every man coming into the world", passing through Justin Martyr and the Alexandrian divines, and voiced again by Dante and other Catholic teachers, which does not allow that negative conclusion; which insists rather that any man, be he sage or savage, who lives by the highest light he knows, even though he has not heard of Christ, has within him the seed of

faith, and may thus be numbered amongst God's elect. We must beware, as Baron von Hügel used to remind us, of being too "incarnational" in our thought; or rather, perhaps, we should reckon that the Incarnation is something wider than we supposed.

At the same time the New Testament does not allow us, I am sure, to be universalists. On the contrary, it confronts us constantly, and never more plainly than in our Lord's own teaching, with a fearful alternative—with the choice between life and death, salvation and perdition, heaven and hell; and on that razor's edge of choice we have to live. Only let us be clear what the New Testament means by hell. Only once is "eternal punishment" spoken of, and that is in a parable of such sustained imagery that no doctrine can be based on it. The other allusions to the torments of the wicked after death, in the Gospels and in the Revelation of the seer of Patmos, are likewise symbolical, and some of them may be interpreted as signifying the pangs of purgatorial remorse. No: the alternative to eternal life which the New Testament sets before us is most commonly portrayed in terms of death, destruction, perishing and the like. And its instrument is fire. The Jewish term "Gehenna", for example, which is the most definite word for hell in the New Testament, is taken from the great refuse-heap in the valley of Hinnom where the refuse of Jerusalem was burnt; and the purpose of its ever-smouldering fires was simply to destroy what was put there.

What this means is that a man may be so blinded by selfishness, so hardened in conscience, so obdurate in his rejection of the light, that he has lost survival value; he has refused the offer of life, and the divine justice must take its course. The possibility is not wholly outside our experience; for there are few of us who have not at one time or another known what it is to "go to pieces", even if only for a while, and the thought has sometimes haunted us that the process might be irretrievable. The Christian faith endorses that fear. And the discovery of it, the remorse, the sense of final loss and failure, must be infinitely painful. Robert Browning makes the Pope in *The Ring and the Book* speak of

> That sad obscure sequestered state
> Where God un-makes but to re-make the soul
> He else made first in vain. . . .

and that may perhaps be the truth of it. But, however we conceive the event, the prospect is one of anguish.

> The weariest and most loathed earthly life
> That age, ache, penury and imprisonment
> Can lay on nature is a paradise
> To what we fear of death.

So Shakespeare makes Claudio speak in *Measure for Measure*. Christian moralists forbid us to believe of any particular individual that he has been or must be thus condemned. But we shall do well to take to heart the warning for ourselves and our generation.

Let us turn, however, from these sombre thoughts and fears to the language of faith and hope and love in which Christianity in the

early centuries set forth its doctrine and bade men ever embrace and hold fast the blessed hope of everlasting life. The New Testament is singularly reticent with regard to the condition of the faithful departed: instead of the clear-cut maps and chronology of the future life which meet us in later ages in the Western (though not in the Eastern) Church, a few brief, pregnant and picturesque phrases flit across the pages of letters, inscriptions and liturgies. "Abraham's bosom"; "Paradise" or the spiritual garden of delight; "with Christ", "the dead which die in the Lord", "rest"—these are the terms in which the Apostles filled in the detail of the glorious truth that "God is not the God of the dead, but of the living; for all (whether alive or dead to men) live unto him". These are the ideas which govern the thoughts and imaginations of the theologians and of the lay-folk alike throughout the Church of the first four centuries.

Certain features of this outlook stand out with special clearness. There is, first, a note of expectancy, which eventually led to the phrase "The Church Expectant"; for the dead are thought of as looking forward, like the Church on earth, to a final consummation of their lives—sometimes called the second or the general resurrection—when Christ shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father, and God shall be all in all. From this it was not far to the thought of Paradise as a place of growth, progress, training, education. It is not surprising, perhaps, that this idea was developed specially at Alexandria—the Oxford of the ancient world—where the influence of the university was felt throughout the whole region. Moreover, since all education is arduous in proportion as the mind is untrained or the character undisciplined, there is room here for the fire which sanctifies sinful souls, for "the discerning flame", as Clement calls it, "which passes through the soul that walks through fire"; for the self-disgust and contrition which Dante speaks of as the "pain of repentance which calls forth tears".

Secondly, the state of the dead is conceived as one of activity. "They rest from their labours", says my text; but it concludes, "And their works do follow them." They rest from life's drudgery and routine; but their lives' processes, methods, habits, results remain and follow them into the new life. Rudyard Kipling was a good theologian, then, when he wrote *The Last Chantey*. The question is often asked whether the departed have any knowledge of the needs of those on earth whom they have loved. But of all the works that follow them to Paradise, there is surely none greater than the work of love.

This at least is the conviction which underlies the most outstanding of all the features of the Church's outlook on the life after death —the conviction, that is, that it is a life of fellowship with God, with one another, and with us, in the one Church or Body of Christ, which dwells partly in this life and partly in the other. And the bond which links together the members of Christ is prayer. It is natural, therefore, to suppose—and the belief is not without New Testament support—that the blessed dead remember us in their prayers and that we who are still on earth can return the benefit. Take this

epitaph from one of the Catacombs: "Sophronia, mayest thou live with thine own. Sophronia, mayest thou live in the Lord. Sweet Sophronia, thou shalt ever live in God. Sophronia, thou shalt live." We do not know whether it was wife or mother or sister who was thus commemorated. But with what sure foot it moves from the simple outpouring of the heart's grief in prayer to the confident affirmation of the Christian faith—"Sophronia, thou shalt live"! Other epitaphs run: "Jesus, Lord, remember our child"; "God refresh thy spirit"; or "In peace be thy spirit." Or you may take this passage from an Egyptian liturgy of the fourth century: "Sanctify these souls" (a list of names has already been read out), "for thou knowest all souls; sanctify all souls that rest in the Lord, and number them with all thy holy powers, and give them a dwelling-place in thy kingdom." The fact is that from the end of the second century onwards the Christian belief that the prayers of the living avail for the dead is affirmed by overwhelming testimony; and if they besought for them any particular gift, it was simply peace or refreshment, or growth in knowledge or in holiness. Surely it is a sound rule, and one wholly consonant with the fifth Commandment which bids us Honour our Father and Mother, that no one whom we have ever loved enough to have them regularly in our prayers shall pass out of them because they have died.

You will observe that I have made no distinction between "Paradise" and "Heaven"; nor did the Church of antiquity, beyond recognizing lower and higher ranges in the life to come. Men's thoughts on these things had not become schematized, still less commercialized, as we know that they became in later ages. Canonization was yet to come; and in any case the Church's calendar of saints is as much a calendar of fame as of holiness. Yet the concept of Heaven as the final goal of every redeemed person was never far out of mind. Here the fellowship of the state of purification which follows death is made perfect, the purgatorial pains of penitence and growth and adjustment to the light all done away, sorrow swallowed up in everlasting bliss, and prayer in praise and adoration. In that blessed company of all faithful people may we at the last be numbered.

E. G. Selwyn.

Great Pastors—I. St Basil the Great

Everyone knows that at one time in the fourth century the bishops, travelling to and fro on their ecclesiastical business and travelling at the expense of the government, ruined the finances of the public postal service. Where in another generation the eminent pastor might resent the monotonous hours which he must devote to Church Assembly or to Faith and Order committees, the pastor of that century resented the absorbing proportion of time which he must spend in ecumenical diplomacy—journeying, debating in synods, dictating letters, drafting formulas, arguing in private. This

was the task which the bishops, Basil among them, set first in importance. The peace, the unity, the faith of the Church, were at stake. "We are bound," wrote Basil to Athanasius, "to put the interests of peace before everything else"; or to another: "I think that the one great aim of all who are truly serving the Lord ought to be the reconciliation of the divided Churches."

Hence endless letters, fruitless arguments, desperate appeals. Athanasius must be persuaded to abandon the episcopal candidate to Antioch whom he and the West had recognized—but Athanasius was not the yielding sort. Messengers must be sent with requests and information to Rome and Pope Damasus—but Rome and Pope Damasus were suspicious because Basil was backing the wrong candidate at Antioch. (Like many schisms, the division which began on dogmatic grounds became almost impossible to heal even though the dogmatic grounds had been superseded as the prime motive for division.) Damasus must be persuaded to visit the East, or at least to send ambassadors, and certainly to clear the Roman see of the suspicion of Sabellianism. On the other wing Basil was struggling to fight the assailants of the Holy Spirit's divinity (and found time to write the *De Spiritu Sancto*): working to keep neighbouring Churches in the true faith, forcing the right candidates into vacant sees. He was not always scrupulous in his methods—his own election to Caesarea in Cappadocia in 370 was not achieved without the aid of subterfuge and intrigue. There was no selfish ambition in this. He was convinced that the cause of orthodoxy needed him in the see of Caesarea. As his chief supporter put it, "The Holy Ghost must win."

The quest for the peace of the Church, in which he seemed to himself to fail so grievously, was not undertaken only because the maintenance of the true faith depended upon it, not only because unity was the Lord's will. The quarrelling affected the pastoral care of the diocese. Orthodoxy, heresy, schism, were entangled with simple cases of clerical discipline. If the bishop tried to discipline an erring cleric, the cleric was likely to find support among some other ecclesiastical party. Put into Anglican terms, it was as though an incumbent of one school of thought, accused by a bishop of another school of neglecting his cure, were to rally party opinion to his side and transfer the issue from discipline to churchmanship. Basil experienced much of this: "Men hide their private malice and pretend that they oppose you for the sake of nothing but the truth."

From the surviving material we are only able to gain glimpses of the pastoral work in the diocese. The problem was too many clergy, not too few—but too many of the wrong sort. The government had exempted clergy from conscription. The bishops were then plagued with numerous applications for the subdiaconate from persons who wanted to avoid military service. It was easy to find ordinands: but Basil complained more than once that the standard was deplorably low, and announced the principle that it was better to have few good clergy than many indifferent clergy: if the right man can be found, "I think the one man is worth as much as the many". Financial difficulties hardly existed. Some of the clergy still earned their own liv-

ings by crafts of various kinds: and the growing number of donations and legacies combined with the generosity of the government in exempting, to render the financial problems slight. There were more serious worries about the homes of the clergy. The increasing hostility to the *Subintroductae* and the growing acceptance of the ascetical ideals caused trouble for every bishop who had to seek to expel even innocent housekeepers from the homes of the clergy. Sometimes Basil would ordain a man to the diaconate so that he could perform the chores of the church and the clergy house. In one case at least this proved disastrous: a man who was selected because he was skilful with his hands had his head turned by ordination, gathered a band of virgins and declared himself patriarch.

In the midst of these preoccupations Basil did not neglect his laity. In the suburbs of Caesarea he built a great hospital for the poor, which his group of ascetics helped to administer. He built churches. He distributed relief in times of famine or need. Like many other bishops, he sent frequent requests to the civil authorities—to secure protection for wronged men, the just execution of wills, mercy for the condemned, respect for the (embryo) right of sanctuary, exemption from or diminution of taxes upon ecclesiastical property. He preached frequent sermons, normally with careful written preparation. In the early mornings he preached (in his last years toothlessly) to congregations of men before they set off to work, congregations which stamped and clapped and talked and walked about the basilica, but which none the less seem to have hung upon his word. Problems of marriage and adultery absorbed a proportion of his thought and time. To individuals he was not universally accessible. We know that he was found to be reserved; and he was not ready to waste his time with trivial inquirers—we find him refusing to make time for a private interview with a widow who wanted him to interpret her dream. But this did not mean a neglect of individuals. He was always ready to offer interpretations of disputed passages of Scripture. He took particular trouble over the persecuted. We have from his hand a number of charming letters of consolation to the bereaved. And we have a letter from a monk who had tried the desert unsuccessfully and had found at Basil's hospital wise direction for the spiritual life. "Caves and rocks we have always ready for us: but the help we get from our fellow-men is not always at hand."

Basil loved the retreat by his ancestral home on the river Iris at Annesi (he was one of the rare Christian thinkers of that age to love natural beauty) and retired to it sometimes, to his ascetic brotherhood at Caesarea more often. Here he found peace. "In no other thing do I find rest for my soul but in your progress and perfection in the commandments of Christ." From his "brothers" he was ready to receive consolation and advice. He never longed, quite as Gregory the Great longed, to retire for ever from the episcopal burden which he had taken up—unlike Gregory he had done everything in his power to secure the burden. But with his "brothers" he was at home. Only the Shorter Rules were written after he had become a bishop. But this, like the earlier ascetical writings, breathes a spirit of serenity

rarely to be found in the letters of the busy administrator. It is still the ruler speaking. He retired into the brotherhood rather to conduct a retreat than to make one. But the grim tone which sometimes creeps into the letters of the fighter for orthodoxy is absent from the rules of the fighter for perfection. Perhaps there is something staccato about the Shorter Rules, characteristic of the now busy man: perhaps also there is a less decisive answer at times—the bishop has had to see two sides where the ascetic leader had seen only one. But the same spirit pervades the whole corpus.

Basil's ascetic groups—brotherhoods and sisterhoods—were societies attempting primarily to live in prayer and holiness and secondarily engaged on pastoral work—running the hospital, visiting the sick, administering relief, educating children. They were not representative of the monastic movement developing in Egypt and Syria. Basil had once, for a short time, visited Egypt and Syria: but it is probable that he was only a little influenced by the visit in framing his ascetical thought. His groups rather look back to the groups of ascetics in association with the primitive congregations than to the new Egyptian movement, though they also show how easily the ascetics were turning into monks. Basil rejected the solitary life. Man is "a non-monastic (i.e. gregarious) animal": and it is the necessity of social living which offers the opportunity for brotherly love. He treated the sinner and the disobedient with severity: and his demands in the earlier rules are so rigid as to be at points technically erroneous in language. But with this severity he combined a level-headedness and common sense in administering the corporate life: reasonable food, reasonable clothing, a reasonable equipment for daily work. And throughout he sought to build the groups by showing them how everything which they sought to do was related to the foundation of Christian living—the love of God.

The long struggle—against false doctrine, intrigues at the imperial court, slander, misrepresentation—left its scars. His health began to give way when he was still in the middle forties. Some form of rheumatism made it painful to move—yet he must travel. His weakened frame (he once compared it to a cobweb) became liable to repeated attacks of fever: he could not digest food properly and began to sleep badly. He tried a month's treatment at some hot springs, but vainly: and the last two years he was expecting the early death which came to him at the age of 49 or 50, in 379. The physical decline and the personal strain encouraged his innate reserve. And there is no doubt that he began to feel that the world was against him—"When I look about me, there seems to be nobody on my side." He compared himself to Elijah on Mount Horeb or Jonah in the whale's belly. "You all hate me", he began a letter to the clergy of a neighbouring town. He looked on the Church as a sinking ship and harked back to the good old days when Christians lived at peace among themselves. "Can the Lord have wholly abandoned his Churches?" He even began to doubt human nature. There was a moment (only a moment) when he thought charity did not really

exist in men—"an empty word that gives a fair-seeming appearance to the speaker, but does not actually exist in human hearts."

Even friendly critics have accused him of sourness and arrogance. He was without question a stern and hard hitter: and, rarely, his judgments carry a ferocity which repels. But so far as we can judge him from his remains, he was neither sour nor arrogant—unless it is sour to be pessimistic and arrogant to know that you are in the right. There was self-pity, towards the end, but never the kind of self-pity which weakens the will. He had somewhere acquired a steel backbone. He stood as firm against the threats of the emperor Valens and his officials as against the foes of orthodoxy, undisciplined clergy, or disobedient ascetics. Yet it is an error to think him grim. He was shy (he easily blushed), and Gregory of Nyssa wrote of his "silence more effective than speech". But towards individuals high or lowly he showed deep qualities of friendliness and affection, was always ready with sympathy to the sufferer or encouragement to men struggling with difficult or unrewarding work. A prophet is not always honoured in his own family: the name of Great was bestowed upon Basil by that young brother to whom he had once had to write one of his scathing letters.

Basil is a warning against pessimism and against the desire to see results. He died thinking that his fight for the unity and faith of the Church had failed hopelessly: and two years later everything for which he stood was vindicated at the Council of Constantinople. He died with his ascetical writings suspect for error: and those same writings, wisely interpreted, profoundly influenced the development of Eastern and Western monasticism.

For further reading: Volume VIII of the *Nicene and Post-Nicene* Fathers includes translations of the *De Spiritu Sancto, Hexaemeron* and the Letters (the Letters are also translated in the Loeb Classical library, four volumes). Volume VII of the same series includes Gregory Nazianzene's oration (No. 43) describing Basil's life. W. K. Lowther Clarke translated *The Ascetic Works of S. Basil* (S.P.C.K., 1925, valuable introduction and notes) and *The Life of S. Macrina* (S.P.C.K., 1916). Gregory of Nyssa's *Encomium* is translated by Stein (1928).

For general problems see especially S. Giet, *Les Idées et l'Action sociales de S. Basile,* and, by the same author, *Sasimes* (both published 1941). There are useful articles in the *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique* (by P. Allard) and the *Dictionnaire d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* (by G. Bardy). F. Loofs, *Eustathius von Sebaste und die Chronologie der Basilius-Briefe* (1898) is still important.

For the ascetical work, E. F. Morison, *S. Basil and his Rule* (1912); W. K. Lowther Clarke, *S. Basil the Great* (1913); D. Amand, *L'Ascèse monastique de S. Basile* (1950).

Owen Chadwick.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Dr Croxall is the British Embassy Chaplain at Copenhagen.

The Rev. R. D. Middleton is Vicar of St Margaret's Church, Oxford.

Dr Selwyn is Dean of Winchester.

The Rev. Owen Chadwick is Fellow and Tutor of Trinity Hall, Cambridge.

CORRESPONDENCE

CHRISTIAN BURIAL

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

The time seems overdue for a consideration, by any in authority in the Church, of the theology of Christian burial. This has recently been considered in the pages of THEOLOGY, but there seems more to be said or asked.

In two respects the Prayer-book service is almost always disregarded—the prayers are taken in church before the interment is conducted in the churchyard, and a sermon is preached. Perhaps we should say an oration is delivered: but newspapers always speak of it as a sermon. Whereas the service seeks to draw away the attention of the mourners from themselves and from all ephemeral affairs and lift them above ground level to the heavenlies, the sermon never seems to have any concern with eternal realities and the Divine Nature and the Christian hope: it is a eulogy pronounced upon the deceased. "Everyone who knew so-and-so will retain very pleasant memories of him. He was at all times an enjoyable and lively companion", etc. This is part of a newspaper report of a "memorial service" at which the urn containing cremated ashes was placed on the chancel steps. The service was followed by "a private interment". The newspaper headline was "Vicar's tribute to local Major".

"Rigorist's" recent comment in your pages on the fashionable Anglican wedding will need to be corrected, for the fashionable London world has—for how long? a generation?—added the fashionable funeral or the still more fashionable "memorial service" as the other principal Anglican activity.

It is now beginning to be the correct thing to be present in church and absent from the concluding ceremony of the "private" interment. The funeral is going the way of the baptismal service. Is it fanciful to assume that in another twenty years' time things so disgusting as coffins and holes in the ground will be entirely in the background, and that after a satisfactory laudation of the deceased suitably enshrined with music and a general odour of sanctity not too obtrusive the party will adjourn, for sherry and sandwiches, agreeably diverted?

For a pagan population this may be a charming development: but to prepare those who live for the hour of their death, and to convey true Christian fortitude and hope, and to build up the community for Christian living, could there be a more thorough bowdlerizing of the Prayer-book funeral service? Add to this the frequent conspiracy of doctor and nurse and relatives to keep from the dying person the fact of approaching death and to prevent all preparation therefor, and the very considerable list of eminent ecclesiastics who lend themselves to-day to this degeneracy makes a parish priest wonder in which direction the blind are leading the blind.

It will not have escaped notice that one of the city churches has

set itself to cater for funerals in a special way, and it will be interesting to watch the development.

Recently in a parish whose vicar had from time to time declared his intention to have no sermons at funerals the suffragan bishop is reported to have phoned the principal mourner stating his intention of being present with his robes and offering to preach the sermon. What does a parish priest do who wishes to use the Prayer-book service and also to carry out what appears to be the theological and religious intention of that service?

For obvious reasons I beg leave to sign myself, sir,

INQUIRER.

SCOTTISH BY-PASS

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

The Dean of Chichester, addressing the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury, said that in the conversations between the Church of England and the Church of Scotland the Episcopal Church in Scotland was by-passed because two established Churches wanted to speak to one another and on the matter of unity approached one another on the basis of what was established rather than of what was Christian. These are grave words, but although Erastianism both north and south of the Border is to be guarded against it cannot be held accountable for all or even nearly all the difficulties of the situation.

There is indeed Erastian misunderstanding of the Scottish ecclesiastical background in the attitude of many visitors from England, some of them dignitaries of the Church, who do not recognize the authority of the Scottish bishops. On the other hand, there are those visitors of a different colour of churchmanship who refer to the church buildings of the Establishment as chapels and remark sadly that "Dissent seems to be terribly strong here".

But the Scottish Episcopal Church herself is not without blame. In her repudiation of the misnomer "the English Church" so commonly applied to her she has protested too much. The title is of course historically inaccurate, but it might have been wiser to accept it as a nickname which at least served to indicate to English immigrants ignorant of church history that here was their own Church. This was tacitly recognized during the second World War when, for the benefit of the floating English population, large posters bearing the letters "C. of E." appeared on the notice-boards of churches whose incumbents would strongly have resented any suggestion that they belonged to "the English Church". Smaller lettering indicated to the theologically minded that the identity was not absolute, but "C. of E." was the operative part of the poster. In quite rightly disclaiming the role of an English Mission to Scotland the Scottish Episcopal Church by her excess of zeal has obscured her position as part of the Anglican Communion.

But there is another factor which makes for misunderstanding and for which the Scottish Episcopal Church cannot be held responsible. Many Scottish boys, sons of Presbyterian parents, are educated at English public schools and are there presented for confirmation. As often as not they are prepared by their housemasters, who are rarely in Holy Orders and many of whom may not even know that the Established Church of Scotland is Presbyterian. These lads come back to Scotland without the faintest idea that, having been confirmed, they now owe their allegiance to the Scottish Episcopal Church. Would it not be possible for English bishops confirming at public schools to make searching inquiries about the instruction given on such matters to the children of non-Anglican parents?

Yours etc.,

J. S. MacArthur.

South Luffenham Rectory,
Oakham.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Physical Phenomena of Mysticism. By Herbert Thurston, S.J. Edited by J. H. Crehan, S.J. Burns Oates. 35s.

The present volume consists of a collection of some seventeen articles and papers found among Fr Thurston's literary remains. They cover a wide range of phenomena, from such interesting trivialities as levitation and bodily elongation among Christians and spiritualists alike, through tokens of ambiguous import such as living without eating, to the really significant phenomena of stigmatization and bodily incorruption after death.

Perhaps the main contribution of the collection will be to restore the whole subject to the realm of respectability, at all events, outside the Roman communion; while the thorough and sensitive way in which the evidence is examined should enable the less critical and more fervent among Romanists to take these things a little more for granted and avoid distraction from the ultimate concern of religion.

For the evidence, taken in its entirety, is impressive, far more so than casual notices of isolated phenomena would lead one to suppose. In the case of stigmata, bodily incorruption, and living for long periods without food beyond that of the altar, it appears to be conclusive, and calculated to convince the open minded even though the faith of the Bible did not already predispose one to expect such things.

Fr Thurston possessed remarkable qualities of fairness, caution, and judgment. He is quick to expose the merely bogus, wherever he finds it. No evidence is allowed to pass merely bcause it is offered in the name of sanctity, Roman or otherwise. On the other hand, evidence for non-natural phenomena outside his communion is squarely faced, accepted, and insisted on if it will bear the scrutiny of an acute mind. Yet no matter how strong the evidence, how venerable

the subject, or how important the phenomena, he steadily refuses to be committed to the view that any of them were the direct work of God. It is not until we reach p. 362 that we even come upon an open admission of the possibility of miracle. Usually we are not even allowed to assume the intervention of the supernatural. "It is not the aim of this volume", he says, "to solve problems" (i.e. whether these phenomena are of divine origin or otherwise), "but to state and classify facts. It seems particularly necessary to reiterate this caution in approaching a question where the apparent inconsistency of God's dealings with his elect is more than usually puzzling and difficult of explanation."

His chapter on the whole subject of stigmatization is perhaps the most interesting and valuable part of the book. Here again it is not the phenomena or the sanctity which are in question, but the divine origin which in general is doubted. His survey of the evidence available leads him to the conclusion that "stigmatization may be the result of what I will venture to call a 'crucifixion complex' working itself out in subjects whose abnormal suggestibility may be inferred from the unmistakable symptoms of hysteria which they had previously manifested". He notes that no case of stigmata was heard of before the beginning of the thirteenth century, from which he infers that St Francis created what he calls this "crucifixion complex". "It became a pious obsession; so much so that in a few exceptionally sensitive individuals the idea conceived in the mind was realized in the flesh." His valuable discussion of hysteria leads him to the conclusion that "what predisposes to the reception of stigmata is not unusual virtue, but some form of nervous susceptibility, more often met with in women than in men".

There are two misprints, on pp. 74 and 163, and an excellent index.

CHEADLE HULME. J. K. BYROM.

THE BOOK OF UNVEILING. A Study of the Revelation of St John. By M. R. Newbolt. S.P.C.K. 15s.

We need plenty of aids to the Revelation of St John, partly because of its intrinsic importance, partly because fanatics can't leave it alone and they must be answered. This latest aid is described by the author as an elementary commentary for the general reader of the Bible—though that reader is expected to follow untranslated Latin and to understand the adjective "Marcionite"—written on the theory that the Apocalypse is "an unveiling of what is round us now and to the end of time, and that it is a record of visions or pictures in the mind, received 'in the spirit' having the peculiar quality of such 'paranormal' mental states". Canon Newbolt holds that the visions were spread over nearly half a century, though perhaps put together about 95, but that it is the great event of the fall of Jerusalem in 70 to which the earlier visions look forward and the later ones look back. This view enables him to side-step many of the difficulties which confront those who feel more must be allowed for the

marked elements of continuity in the narrative. He continually underplays the element of veiled historical reference, and holds (with Archbishop Benson) that "St John sees principles which are manifested in history rather than particular persons or events". Hence Babylon is no more Rome than London, New York, or Moscow; but it is, apparently, Jerusalem, and the great lament is interpreted as referring mainly to that city. There is, therefore, an element of uncertainty in the basic method of exegesis, and the author is compelled to admit in several places that the text *is* concerned with historical references, though he does not say much more about them than that they are difficult or obscure. It is extremely difficult to hold the balance between the different elements in the Apocalypse, but it does seem that Canon Newbolt is reacting excessively against an historical treatment which he feels loses the aesthetic and religious treasures of the book. Does not the greatness of it lie in the fact that when we have sunk ourselves in its particularity, we find that John speaks a Word of God to our condition? I suspect timeless principles.

This study is well written, and is particularly strong on the cultural and religious background of the milieu in the midst of which John lived. In this connexion stress is laid on Ephesus, "the Benares of the ancient world". Canon Newbolt has enough space to print the Biblical text in full, and also quite lengthy relevant passages from the O.T. and elsewhere. This makes for easy use. The authorities he most frequently quotes are Swete and Carrington. He is very selective in his scale of treatment; some passages, such as the letters to the Seven Churches, are very cursorily dealt with; on others he feels free to range widely. In this way a number of difficulties get passed over, but that hardly matters in comparison with the fact that anyone with a good educational standard to whom *Revelation* is a closed book who chose to work through it with Canon Newbolt as his guide, would find his spiritual horizons immensely widened.

Manchester University. Ronald Preston.

The Patristic Doctrine of Redemption. By H. E. W. Turner. Mowbray. 12s. 6d.

This rather slim volume is based on a course of lectures, and its contents retain something of the form in which they originated. Professor Turner is to be congratulated on calling attention to the need for studying the doctrine and doctrinal implications of patristic theology upon the subject of redemption. For good practical reasons, no doubt, this subject has been neglected; and it should be thus neglected no longer. But so little precise formulation was given to it by the Fathers themselves, and so much of what they thought about it is expressed in the shape of implication rather than of statement, that a lifetime of study would be needed before anybody could produce a really satisfactory account of what redemption meant to the Christians of the first five centuries. That, however, is a task which

Mr Turner makes no effort for the present to attempt. He is lecturing on this aspect and on that; he is calling attention to strands of thought but not synthesizing; he is surveying the need rather than pretending to supply it.

His basis is a division, modern more than primitive, which distinguishes four lines of thought about redemption, according to which Christ is presented as Illuminator, Conqueror, Author of "deification", or Victim. It is important to remember that this division employs modern and not ancient categories. His use of it enables Mr Turner to display to modern eyes some of the riches to be found in ancient expositions of redemption, and to show how permanently relevant they are to religion. But it does not wholly make for satisfactory treatment of patristic teaching, which is necessarily fragmentated, and sometimes rather distorted, through being adjusted to a modern theological framework. For instance, the earlier Fathers are really not so given to exemplarism as might be deduced from an unwary reading of these pages: like any preacher, they constantly refer to Christ's example as a powerful moral incentive, but that does not mean that they regard Christ's sacrifice as differing only in degree from other sacrifices, or that it was not an act of God —something far more than a mere demonstration of divine purposes.

It is a defect, not the less serious because it is forced on Mr Turner by his method, that though other aspects of Justin's teaching are referred to, no mention is made of his flat assertion (*Apol.* 1. 63. 16) that "for the salvation of those who believe on him he endured to be set at nought and to suffer, that by his death and resurrection he might conquer death": or again, that no reference is made to the prolonged and detailed insistence of Athanasius in the second *Discourse against the Arians* on Christ the New Man or second Adam. An adequate treatment of the Fathers must begin from the Fathers: if their teaching is broken up and alluded to under what are, in relation to the Fathers, arbitrary modern categories, a misleading conclusion is virtually inevitable as to the Fathers, or to any particular Father, as a whole. Having said this, one must be grateful for much that Mr Turner says about many points. How true is his *obiter dictum* that "Christology is not the strong point of any of the Cappadocians!" And he makes the modern reader see that there is genuine matter in such strange conceptions as that of fighting demons or of deifying men.

G. L. Prestige.

The Life of the Servant. By Henry Suso. Translated by James M. Clarke. Clarke. 7s. 6d.

It is now nearly a century since Fr T. F. Knox's translation of the autobiography of Blessed Henry Suso appeared. This translation was based upon the defective German text of Diepenbrock, and, for all its merits, was not without errors arising from the fact that the translator had no intimate knowledge of the medieval dialect in

which the original was written. In the meanwhile interest in the psychology of mysticism, and not least of the mysticism of the German Dominicans, has grown apace. This new and accurate translation of the *Life of the Servant* (Suso never mentions himself by name in his writing, but always refers to himself as the "Servant of the Eternal Wisdom") is clear, modern in its idiom, and unaffected. The footnotes leave one in some doubt for what class of person the translation has been made—e.g. "IHS: the first two and last letters of the name of Jesus in the Greek alphabet", or "None: a devotional service sung at the ninth hour". These would suggest that the readers Mr Clarke had in mind are those with but the smallest familiarity with ecclesiastical jargon. But perhaps he would argue that it is better to be explicit than to drive the simple to their dictionaries.

This would appear in fact to be a translation for the layman; as such, it is excellent, and with him it is likely to have its greatest réclame. Ecclesiastical authority has always been more cautious of mystics, tending rather to echo the recent dictum of a certain devout Russian savant, "There is only one way of dealing with mystics; they should be birched, and birched often and severely. Then if they are *real* mystics they will go on with their mysticism. And in any case it will not hurt them."

This would certainly seem to be Suso's own view; for the corporal austerities which he describes, culminating in the carving of the Holy Name on his heart, are almost incredible. It is greatly to his credit, exculpating him from the charge of psychopathic abnormality, that he was prepared to throw all his instruments of torture into the river in obedience to divine command. In mortifications, as in all else, Suso reveals himself to be a typical, though saintly, product of the Middle Ages. His saintliness has been ratified by the Church which beatified him: his medievalism may be found by any reader.

It is an exaggeration to call the *Life of the Servant* (as Mr Clarke does in his introduction) a "classic of religious literature". Perhaps it is not even Suso's greatest book. Nevertheless it is a *locus classicus* of the psychology of the mystic. All stages of prayer from conversion to the Unitive Way are here. In temperament Suso was highly strung, ardent, and sensitive; his book is intensely subjective and somewhat disjointed. In devotional quality it is quite different from the Spanish Carmelites; less gigantic, more poignant, less sensible, easier to read, and far less informative. It remains an example of that most precious literary *genre*, the self-analysis of sanctity.

London. Gerard Irvine.

Christian Faith and the Scientific Attitude. By W. A. Whitehouse. Oliver and Boyd. 12s. 6d.

The title of Mr Whitehouse's book is indicative of the change that in recent years has come over the venerable problem of the relation between science and religion. What we are now concerned with is not a conflict of assertions but a contrast of attitudes. It is not a question

of how we are to reconcile the discoveries of geology or biology with the assertions of Scripture and the Christian tradition, but how a man who has grown up in a world dominated by scientific techniques can see the relevance to his concerns of the sort of things that the Bible and theologians say. The matter is rendered more complicated by the fact that, whereas people in the last century whose faith had been upset by science were fully aware of the source of their unsettlement, at the present day the scientific attitude, in the sense of the attitude to the world that is produced by the dominance of science, has deeply influenced multitudes of people who know little or nothing of science and may indeed be quite uninterested in it.

Mr Whitehouse has fully recognized this; the trouble, he says, is "not in a conflict between the teachings of science and those of Christianity, but in a conflict between the spirit and temper of an age of applied science, and the Christian outlook on life". Having briefly discussed the authority of science, he devotes the central part of his book to an exposition of the Christian belief in the three Persons of the Trinity, and then draws his conclusions. Illuminating as this discussion often is, I cannot feel that the real questions have been dealt with.

Mr Whitehouse writes as an avowed Barthian, though both his thought and his style are more temperate than those of some who claim that title. He does not launch abuse against the natural reason, or even dispute that it has some part to play in theological investigations. But it is difficult to see what relation, if any, he holds to exist between reason and faith. He is clear that the scientific attitude is one thing and Christian faith another. He is also clear, if I do not misunderstand him, that the two are fundamentally compatible. But he seems to achieve this compatibility by arranging that they never really meet at all; and it is here that I find his discussion somewhat disconnected and over-simplified. What, after all, is the relation between the natural and the supernatural order? This is the fundamental question for any Christian discussion of the relation between religion and science. How are nature and grace co-operant? Fulfilment without supersession, distinction without separation, union without confusion, these are the guiding notions of discussions such as that which is given by M. Maritain in his monumental work *Les Degrés du Savoir*, and which I miss in Mr Whitehouse's book. But to say this is perhaps only to say that Protestantism is not Catholicism and that a Barthian will not write like a Thomist. Nevertheless, there seem to me to be certain specific problems raised by science for theology, which, while they are not unanswerable, need to be faced. I believe also that there is an organic relationship between scientific and theological thinking which needs to be elicited and elucidated. Both these needs, as I see them, are more or less by-passed by Mr Whitehouse's discussion. I would suggest that perhaps the best use which could be made of his book would be to read it side by side with Dr C. E. M. Joad's last work *The Recovery of Belief*.

E. L. Mascall.

Christ Church,
Oxford.

SHORTER NOTICES

Saint Etheldreda's and Ely Place. By Linwood Sleigh. Paternoster Publications. 4s. 6d.

Here is a little book obviously for Roman Catholic consumption. Of the great Gothic churches and cathedrals we are told "they are above all else museum pieces, works of art of another age, echoes of days with a faith which today is not theirs. . . . But St Etheldreda's is alive." I suppose that it is natural for a man starting with the premises of a modern Roman Catholic to feel like that, but the feelings are certainly not subdued in this book. I took up the book hoping to find a description of a medieval bishop's town house and habits, but only one short chapter of less than ten pages is devoted to this subject. On the other hand, the book does give a succinct yet comprehensive survey of the architecture and history of that extremely interesting chapel of St Etheldreda and of Ely Place. It is well written and makes pleasing, if sometimes irritating, reading. The titles of its nine chapters epitomize the book—"St Etheldreda's and the See of Ely", "The Beginnings of Ely House", "The Architecture of St Etheldreda's", "St Etheldreda's before the Reformation", "The Domestic Buildings", "The Home of Bishops and Princes", "The Secular Annexation", "Gondomar and Ely House", "The End of Ely House", "The Saffron Hill and Baldwin's Gardens Mission", "Reconciliation", "The Parish Church of St Etheldreda", "The Holy Hand", "Ely in London".

In view of its obvious Romanism it is all the more interesting to find that the book advocates an uncompromising English and medieval use so far as furnishing and fittings go.

The book sets out to offer to the Roman Catholic visitor a description of St Etheldreda's and a history of both it and Ely Place and, in this purpose, it succeeds.

East Dereham. Noel Boston

The Goad of Love. By Walter Hilton. Faber and Faber. 18s.

The Goad of Love is a Latin devotional work which was widely read and valued in the Middle Ages. It is a composite work, and contains as its core a treatise on the devotional life by a Franciscan Friar, Julian of Milan: this is preceded by some tender meditations on the Passion of our Lord, and the work ends with some passages by an unknown author on the Pater Noster, Ave Maria, and Salve Regina. The great fourteenth-century mystic Walter Hilton translated the work, and Miss Clare Kirchberger has now edited it from MSS. She has done her part most ably, and provided an informative introduction, useful footnotes, and a glossary.

Miss Kirchberger declares that her work has a twofold purpose. It makes available a famous medieval spiritual classic, and adds at the same time to our knowledge and understanding of Hilton. It does this because Hilton when he translated the work made many

emendations and additions to the original text, thereby affording us a useful insight into his mind and ideas. One change is striking: Hilton is constantly inserting phrases about Christ. Here is a typical example in a passage where Hilton is speaking about contemplation: ". . . make Jesus Christ aye present before the sight of thy soul, as it is before said, and covet nothing for to have but him only, and whatso thou hearest named or seest, or to be given to thee of worldly things reck no more of it than of so many leaves. Endeavour to stable thy thought only in him. . . ." True mysticism is Christocentric. "No man cometh to the Father," said our Lord, "save by me."

True contemplation does not lead to indifference to the lot of our fellow men. On the contrary, it leads to a new sensitiveness to the needs of others, a quickened awareness of need. The more a man is united to God through Christ, the more will he be united to his fellow men. ". . . Thou that wouldest be a spouse of Jesus Christ", says the writer, "and wouldest find him that thy soul loveth, I shall tell thee where thy Jesus, thy spouse, lieth and where thou mayest find him. Not in the midday only, as Holy Writ saith, but in thy sick brother that is crooked and blind or diseased in other bodily sickness. . . ."

LIVERPOOL. O. R. CLARKE.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST MATTHEW. By G. E. P. Cox. S.C.M. Press. 9s.

In this commentary in the Torch Bible series the lecturer in divinity and classics at St Katherine's Training College, Liverpool, "makes no claim to originality", but he gathers the harvest of much recent Biblical theology, to which indebtedness is expressed. In the course of a brief introduction he dates the Gospel between 90 and 100, as does Dr Kilpatrick; but as Dr Manson has said, there is no reason for putting it quite so late.

The commentary brings out well the divisions of the Gospel and the comments are concise and sensible. Sound as the reliance on Dr C. H. Dodd usually is, it leads to the dogmatic statement about 4. 17 that "the Kingdom has come" is a better translation than "it is at hand"; this neglects the query whether the supposed Aramaic original meant more than "it is at the door", not "it is over the doorstep". Realized eschatology is not the key to open all locks. Though Gore's famous work on the Sermon on the Mount is apparently unused, the comments on the Sermon are brief and good. Many indeed of the notes elsewhere reveal the writer's sanity and insight—e.g. on Fasting, 6. 6–18, where the tortuous reasoning of some commentators to avoid the implication that Jesus ever inculcated this or any rule for his followers is not adopted. Other valuable notes are those on the Son of Man, which might well have been more extensive, and on the Petrine Confession, where controversial issues are strenuously avoided. This is a good commentary for S.C.M. groups to study.

MERTON COLLEGE, OXFORD. C. S. C. WILLIAMS.

Irénée de Lyon: Contre les Hérésies, Livre III. By F. Sagnard, O.P. Editions du Cerf, Paris. 1,740 francs.

Irenaeus is a figure of such decisive importance in the history of early Christian doctrine that the lack of a satisfactory edition is surprising. Père Sagnard not only gives a French translation. He has gone to much pains to provide a critical edition of the text. He has begun with book III because of its doctrinal interest; in this book Irenaeus stresses the authority of tradition in the interpretation of Scripture: orthodoxy is guaranteed by the faithful handing on of Christian teaching in the churches of apostolic foundation. Even if Père Sagnard's introduction and notes reveal him to be more concerned with contemporary Papist dogmatic than with a historical understanding of Irenaeus, his book is a welcome contribution to patristic study.

H. Chadwick.

Cambridge.

Congregationalism. A Study in Church Polity. By Douglas Horton. Independent Press. 6s.

The Deep Church. By Melville Chaning-Pearce (Nicodemus). Gollancz. 12s. 6d.

The Principle of Authority. By P. T. Forsyth. Independent Press. 18s.

Dr Horton's book is of considerable interest for those concerned with reunion. The author is Moderator of the International Congregational Council and Minister of the General Council of the Congregational Christian Churches in the U.S.A. His work has led him to face, far more than Congregationalists commonly do, what seems to the outsider to be the central difficulty of the congregationalist view of the Church, the theological status of Christian bodies other than the local congregation. His own interest is especially directed to the theology of the "council", but he has also much of interest to say on "the Universal Visible Church". He contends by historical and theological argument that congregationalism and independency, so far from being identical, are separable and even antithetical conceptions. Thus if his views should gain acceptance, Congregationalism would feel much more at ease in the ecumenical movement, and other churches would find it much easier to negotiate with it. However, it would be a mistake to think that this book is of importance only for Congregationalism. If it is true that Anglicans are at present engaged in taking elements of congregationalism "into their system", through Biblical study and through such movements as "Parish and People", then we too shall have to take much more seriously than before the ecclesiological problem of the nature of units other than the parish or the diocese. This book will be of help to any who wish to engage in this inquiry. The reviewer also found Dr Horton extremely suggestive in relation to present attempts to think out the theology of an ecumenical community composed of members of dif-

ferent churches. Dr Horton's enthusiasm does, however, lead him astray when, perhaps without quite noticing what he is doing, he solves the ecumenical problem by what amounts to a plea that we should all become Congregationalists.

The Deep Church is a difficult book to review fairly. One is immediately prejudiced against it by the adulatory and over-written introduction by Dr George Seaver, from which one learns that if one should dare to disagree with the book one must belong to the ranks of the dogmatic traditionalist ecclesiastical enemy, and be the exponent of "Churchianity"—a word one had hoped was decently buried. However, the book itself is not as bad as might be expected from such a beginning, and contains much that should be listened to with some care by those who are confident about the recovery of a high view of the Church in our time. Dr Seaver in fact does the author a disservice by his extravagant claims for him. *The Deep Church* has little of importance to contribute on its ostensible theme, the constructive criticism of High, Low and Broad views of the Church, because the author does not submit himself to the discipline of grappling theologically either with the Biblical data or with the traditional "catholic" and "protestant" views, to find out what they are saying at their best. Because his understanding remains external, especially of the "catholic" view, his violent blows usually miss the mark. The strength of the book lies in some authentic spiritual experience which comes out most in the middle chapters, where his first-hand analysis of the way back to the Church of some modern people challenges easy assumptions about the authority of the Church. Where as here Mr Chaning-Pearce is most Biblical he is also most stimulating and helpful, as in his defence of Christian mysticism against neo-orthodox criticism. At other points he seems to lapse into syncretism of various kinds, and I am not sure that he has really worked out his view of authority, which is the crucial issue of his book. His account of Berdyaev's untranslated *Essai sur une métaphysique eschatologique* is useful; it discloses all too clearly the Gnostic character of Berdyaev's thought. *The Deep Church* is an essay in "existential Christianity". This is not the only way, and in the reviewer's judgment not the best, to use existentialist insights. And must "existentialist" thinkers overwrite so tiringly as Mr Chaning-Pearce?

One feels that Mr Chaning-Pearce, and not only he, should study the third book under review, the reissue of Forsyth's *The Principle of Authority*. Those who have read Forsyth's other works will know what to expect: the book abounds in aphorisms of great depth and penetration, and in wise comments on tendencies that have not ceased to be contemporary forty years after the first issue of the book. The style is highly rhetorical, and reads much better aloud (though one can hardly read over 400 pages aloud), and the manner of argument circular rather than systematic. But the main thesis of the book, that the essential authority is the holy regenerating grace of God in the Cross of Christ, given to but not proceeding from religious experience, comes out more and more clearly as it is examined from

one point of view after another, in relation to the soul, the Church and society. This is a book of quite first-class importance, and defies review in less than an article.

WELLS. WILLIAM NICHOLLS.

THE CHURCH IN THE NEW SOCIAL ORDER. By Emil Brunner, S.C.M. Press. 3s. 6d.

Mature theological scholarship is combined with an intimate understanding of the British Welfare State to produce a concentration of brilliant insights which give a stimulatingly fresh basis for a Christian and realistic approach to the modern situation. After reminding us that "The Ekklesia of the New Testament is something entirely personal, namely the communion between Christ and his people, who are his by faith, and the communion of these people with one another through their communion in Christ . . . and that the Ekklesia is in no way an institution, an order, but a personal life flowing from beyond the temporal world", Brunner affirms that the Church's task is the same in the new social order as in any previous or future social order. But "every social order presents a specific challenge to the Church, and it creates for it specific problems". Rejecting as foolish and dangerous any attempt to find a solution to our unsolved problems in further structural changes in the line of further socialization, he maintains that what is most needed to-day is "personalization and communalization within the given framework of this new social order". The Church's own and exclusive contribution towards this is "to personalize and communalize the preaching of the Word of God. . . . Both the Church and theology are about to discover a double fact: the sociological meaning of the Word and the theological meaning of community; or, to put it in one concept, the unity of the Word and Sacrament". He goes on to develop what seems an essentially sound and fruitful approach to problems which communism and existentialism have sensed, but signally failed to solve. "It seems to be the task of us Christians of this age to rediscover the unity of truth and community, of truth and existence, in the sacramental existence of Jesus Christ. . . . It is this which the social order is craving for." Here indeed is profound wisdom in too highly concentrated a form to be fully appreciated at one reading, but many, I am sure, will agree that it is the best 3s. 6d. worth we have come across for a long time.

COLEFORD. E. W. BREWIN.

THE PERFECT LAW OF LIBERTY. An Interpretation of Psalm 119. By R. R. Williams. Mowbray. 3s. 6d.

Dr Liddon once wrote that the 119th Psalm represented in the highest degree the paradox of seeming simplicity overlying fathomless depths. In this excellent small volume Canon Williams has successfully managed to combine simplicity and depth, and has put the

ordinary reader, who has little time for intensive Bible study, deeply in his debt by giving, in less than 70 pages and in simple language, (i) a short Introduction to the Psalm, including notes on its nature, date, and origin; its Christian interpretation, and the virtues and defects of the Prayer Book version; and (ii) a Commentary, including notes on the meaning of the text, and a doctrinal and devotional instruction on each section. The book concludes with (iii) a Note on the liturgical use of the Psalm in the Christian Church.

We cannot, however, entirely agree with Canon Williams' hints that the author's expressions of self-satisfaction "must make much of the Psalm seem strange to Christian ears". Surely the Psalmist's constant prayers for grace fully recognize that strength to obey must come from God, and animate the whole Psalm with a profound spirituality, which shows "no tendency whatever to substitute mechanical observance of rules for the living application of principles".

A. E. H. T.

THE LORD MY LIGHT. By J. Rickaby, S.J. Burns Oates. 16s.

SPIRITUAL TEACHING OF FATHER STEUART, S.J. By Katharine Kendall. Burns Oates. 16s.

The former of these books is a selection of well-written papers read by Fr Rickaby to undergraduates at Oxford and Cambridge round the year 1900.

Several passages date this selection; as, for example, "In the next world, the reward will be given, amply and evidently, apart from favour and interest, irrespectively of birth and education and wealth. This conviction . . . has for generations borne up the hearts of our English poor. Maybe, they may not prove so tolerant of the unequal distribution of this world's goods, when they shall come to lose their belief in a God who will finally deal with every man according to his personal deserts" (p. 146).

Fr Rickaby claims that "these conferences are not controversial" (p. 194), but a great deal of them appears to be a designed denigration of Protestantism; here as so often Protestantism is caricatured before it is criticized: "to the true protestant, God is a sort of world-spirit, varying in various ages and among different nations, and falling in with the private judgment of every individual man" (p. 67). (Shades of Calvin!) After this kind of misrepresentation we are not surprised even at this conclusion of Fr Rickaby. "The belief in the immortality of the soul and in the ultimate resurrection of the body, like other fundamental beliefs of Christianity, is getting more and more dependent upon the continued existence and presence amongst us of the Catholic and Roman Church. Thinking men are finding that out . . . and the alternative is becoming clearer between mere animalism and catholicism" (p. 150).

In the second book Miss Kendall has put together three retreats and ten addresses given by the well-known conductor of retreats, Fr

Steuart, who died in 1948. The first retreat was a four-day retreat given to lay people in March 1939, the second was a short week-end retreat given during the war; both were taken from shorthand notes. They are lively presentations of the Spiritual Exercises of St Ignatius Loyola, but they are rather spoilt by overworked quotations and phrases which had obviously become clichés with Fr Steuart. Both in substance and in style they fall far below his first-rate books for spiritual reading, *Inward Vision* (1929) and *Temples of Eternity* (1931).

The third retreat was an eight-day retreat, which he gave to a religious community six months before his death. This is based on brief notes; the clichés have disappeared, and by far the greater part of it could profitably be used in a private retreat by those outside the Roman communion. The same might be said of several of the addresses appended to these retreats.

OXFORD. S. M. GIBBARD, S.S.J.E.

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF RELIGION. By L. W. Grensted. Oxford University Press. 6s.

CONFLICT AND LIGHT. Edited by Père Bruno, O.C.D. Sheed and Ward. 10s. 6d.

These two books are contrasting and complementary. Grensted's is like a map, a historical guide to the shifting ground between the developing science of psychology and that nebulous territory covered by the word "religion". There is a good and well-informed survey of contemporary psychological theories, except that the recent advances in the so-called physical treatments and their implications for psychology generally are belittled and misunderstood. His concluding phrase is a very good one—namely, that "the findings of psychology are of less importance theoretically and more importance practically than is commonly supposed to be the case"; i.e. the metaphysical implications of psychology about such topics as Does God exist? and What is his nature? are relatively unimportant, whereas the work of the pastor and the practical organization of the Church are illuminated constantly. The point is neatly shown by Grensted's very last sentence, that "True worship can be offered to God as Odin or Zeus, Brahma, or Jehovah, but the truth of that worship is only made plain when the names and the fantasies which they represent fall away, and the final formula of faith is 'God is Love'." Only thus far can the natural science of the mind take us, the rest is Revelation about which the author does not have (and cannot have in this context) anything to say.

The second book is not a map of difficult terrain, but a series of short and often vivid excursions into particular aspects of psychiatry and Christianity. The origin of the book appears to have been a conference organized by French Carmelites with contributions from psychiatrists and members of the Order. It is a pity that only one

fraction of the discussion aroused by the papers is printed. Most of the contributors speak from their practical experience as spiritual directors or psychotherapists, and it is difficult to understand the relevance of some contributions, such as the one entitled "Present Norms of Holiness", which gives an account of how the Vatican judges sanctity, and bears a curious resemblance to what one imagines are the deliberations of the committee on Consultants' Distinction Awards. The historical and philosophical background found in Grensted's book is largely ignored, and some theological chapters contain very dry discussions of casuistry and definitions. Freud and Jung are almost the only names found in both books (in neither case are the contributions of the latter really taken into account). Disjointed and incomplete as these essays are, the book is nevertheless a stimulating one. It is clear how the mystical way of life is psychologically something unusual (which is not the same as abnormal). The matters which the psychiatrists deal with are only too commonplace and at the lowest levels of the spiritual life. There is one sentence at the end of the discussion which appears connected with Grensted's belittling of the somatic aspects of psychology—"All the evidence converges in the un-Cartesian and thoroughly Aristotelian conclusion that the soul demands for its fulfilment the participation of the body." In fact, it is hardly paradox to say that at the present time the great problem in the psychology of religion is what to do with the body. We find the rigours of much of past ascetism retrogressive, but an uninhibited hedonism seems worse. A creative synthesis of newer knowledge with the traditional ways of the spiritual life is yet to come.

D. A. Pond.

London.

Social and Cultural Factors in Church Divisions. A Faith and Order Paper. S.C.M. Press. 2s. 6d.

When the Faith and Order Commission met at Chichester in 1949, the Secretary presented to it a letter which he had received from Professor C. H. Dodd concerning "unavowed motives in ecumenical discussions". That devastatingly honest and searching letter resulted in the Commission deciding that, although it was too late to make this subject the material for a separate theological commission, it should be kept in the fore in the preparations for the Lund Conference. The American Committee for Faith and Order promoted further correspondence on the subject and convened a conference in the summer of 1951. Three members from this conference joined a number of European and British Church members—theologians, economists, historians, psychologists, etc.—at a further conference at the Ecumenical Institute at Bossey in November 1951. The Report of this conference, entitled "Non-theological factors that may hinder or accelerate the Church's Unity", together with two of the papers before that conference, one by the Rev. Gerald Cragg of Canada and the other by Professor Jacques Ellul of Bordeaux, are presented in this Faith and

Order Paper, which also includes Professor Dodd's original letter and a preface by the Rev. Oliver Tomkins. This booklet is provided with useful questions for Group discussion, and if only it is widely read and discussed it will certainly be a powerful factor accelerating the Church's unity.

COLEFORD. E. W. BREWIN.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

ADAM AND CHARLES BLACK: Karl Heinrich Rengstorf, *Apostleship* (7s. 6d.); Rudolf Bultmann, *Gnosis* (7s. 6d.).

BLACKFRIARS: *Secular Institutes* (6s.).

BLACKWELL: *Christianity To-day: Challenge and Response* (35th Annual Conference number of *The Modern Churchman*) (7s. 6d.).

DACRE PRESS: L. S. Thornton, *The Dominion of Christ* (25s.).

DENIS DOBSON: Hugh Ross Williamson, *Jeremy Taylor* (15s.).

EVANGELISCHES VERLAGSWERK (STUTTGART): E. Rosenstock-Huessy, *Heilkraft und Wahrheit* (D.M. 13.00).

HARVILL PRESS: Claire Kirchberger (Ed.), *The Coasts of the Country* (15s.).

INDEPENDENT PRESS: Sydney Cave, *The Doctrines of the Christian Faith* [New edition] (12s. 6d.).

INTER-VARSITY FELLOWSHIP: *A Guide to Christian Reading* (5s.).

LUTTERWORTH PRESS: Emil Brunner, *The Christian Doctrine of Creation and Redemption* (25s.).

NISBET: James W. Leitch, *A Theology of Transition* (15s.); John Marsh, *The Fulness of Time* (15s.).

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: G. K. A. Bell, *Randall Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury* (3rd edn.) (45s.).

PRESBYTERIAN BOOK ROOM: J. M. Ross, *Presbyterian Bishops?* (1s. 3d.).

RANDAL PRESS: Geoffrey Handley-Taylor, *A Selected Bibliography of Literature Relating to Nursery Rhyme Reform* (1s.).

HUGH REES: Albert A. Cock, *A Critical Examination of von Hügel's Philosophy* (10s. 6d.).

REGENCY PRESS: "Vindex", *Light Invisible: the Freemasons' Answer to "Darkness Visible"* (10s. 6d.).

ERNST REINHARDT VERLAG (MUNICH): *Prophetie und Mysterium im christlichen Gottesdienst* (n.p.).

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION PRESS: Elsie H. Spriggs, *Pioneers of the New World* (5s. 6d.); G. D. Yarnold, *God's World* (3s.).

S.C.M. PRESS: J. G. Davies, *The Origin and Development of Early Christian Church Architecture* (21s.); H. F. D. Sparks, *The Formation of the New Testament* (13s. 6d.); G. Ernest Wright, *God Who Acts* (8s.); *Faith and Order* [Report of the Lund Conference] (3s. 6d.); Ian Henderson, *Myth in the New Testament* (7s.); Alan Richardson, *The Biblical Doctrine of Work* (5s.); Adam Fox, *Meet the Greek Testament* (8s. 6d.); Rudolf Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament* (Vol. I) (25s.).

S.P.C.K.: R. H. Malden, *The English Church and Nation* (25s.); D. S. Bailey, *Sponsors at Baptism and Confirmation* (10s. 6d.); A. Tindal Hart, *William Lloyd* (30s.).

VANDENHOECK UND RUPRECHT (GÖTTINGEN): Eduard Lohse, *Die Ordination im Spätjudentum und im Neuen Testament* (D.M. 8.40).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher